

SECRET

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Coordination/DCI

SUBJECT: Coordination of Requirements and Collection

1. As you know, OSI has endorsed the suggestion that CCPC be revamped and charged with the coordination of requirements and collection. I believe that with a permanent Chairman and staff such a committee could enhance the collection effort to a point of efficiency that can never be achieved under the present loose, more or less voluntary type of coordination. However, as we are all well aware there are pitfalls which may impede committees at the outset and in the case of the complex field of requirements and collection, I believe your staff can make a contribution which will lay the groundwork and set the pattern for the proposed committee; thereby removing the pitfall of exploring unproductive avenues or getting mired in too much detail.

2. I would hope that your staff could make a preliminary survey of consumers and collectors in order to identify the major problems that should subsequently be attacked by the committee. Functioning as a staff for the DCI your people are experienced, known to the community and will be objective. Whereas, such a survey, made at the direction of a committee chairman without a staff such as yours at his disposal, could well waste valuable time, particularly in culling out subjective opinions. This is not a reflection on a yet unborn committee but recognition of the capability of your staff and the fact, noted in the write-up of your mission, that in functioning as a staff the members are able to shed the feeling of responsibility towards a single agency and concentrate on problems from the community standpoint.

3. My recommendation is that AC/DCI select a number of the highest Priority National Intelligence Objectives, review the requirements that have been written for each and make a detailed check of what is the status of each from the standpoint of collection. The latter step will require that collectors give an

SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: Coordination of Requirements and Collection

honest evaluation of each pertinent requirement and be equally honest in revealing steps taken for collection and the chances of success. A survey of this sort will give a clear picture of what our chances are of getting intelligence on priority objectives and this should be a good base for committee action. In the past DD/I has attempted such a survey, on a very limited basis and the fact that emerges is that there is a very real need for new and realistic tasking of collection facilities, as well as for the development of new facilities and collection devices.

4. You might prefer to stick to the survey outlined above but while your staff is talking to consumers and collectors they may wish to elicit the comments of each on the overall performance of the others. Experience shows that in some instances the "where there's smoke there's fire" adage holds good. Sometimes consumers' requirements are inadequate, sometimes collectors are not doing a thorough job. Most of the time, however, it will be found that misunderstanding of needs and capabilities are the real roots of criticism. Whichever the case the findings should be more grist to the mill of the proposed committee.

5. I urge that you give serious consideration to the idea of using your staff in the capacity I have outlined. If you agree that it has merit and is feasible we shall be prepared to discuss it with you in more detail.

HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence

Distribution:
Orig & 1 - addressee

SECRET

JSC file

19 Apr

SUBJECT: USIB-Requirements Control Committee

1. My interpretation of the intent of the Joint Study Group report, plus my own evaluation of need for a top level group charged with the responsibility for balancing Priority National Intelligence Objectives against Collection assets has prompted me to commit the following thoughts to paper, inasmuch as I shall be unable to attend the meeting in Paul Borel's office at 2:00 on 19 April.

2. The surveys completed by DD/I requirements officers on the subject of collection efforts against ICBM and AR M (project) demonstrate very clearly how easy it is to be fooled or lulled into a sense of false security, through expecting answers to priority requirements of this sort, simply based on the fact that so many people regard the requirement as highest priority and so many people have accepted it for action. The survey we completed was done at the working level and from a security standpoint did not go higher than TOP SECRET COMINT. However, it is perhaps a good illustration of one way the committee I have in mind should work. I do not feel that such a committee can review all requirements nor should it attempt to do so. I would recommend that such a committee select Priority National Intelligence Objectives and one at a time, study what requirements have been written to meet these objectives and what each collector is doing to meet these requirements. (The statistics for the requirements and performance would of course both come out of the OCR facility.) I believe that only by such a thorough and critical look is it possible to tell whether more can be done by existing facilities, either through greater effort on the part of individual collectors or through better coordination of the over-all effort. An example would be that of the futility of serving requirements on military attaches and the Clandestine Services until we can be thoroughly certain that all available information on the targets has been procured from such repositories and processing centers as FDD and NSA. I visualize a case where collection efforts of MAs and agents would be suspended while other sources contributed and rounded up additional information, through their individual efforts. Subsequently the internal collectors could be unleashed, confident that the entire effort had been coordinated. Another example would be the RCC's ability to judge the needlessness of mounting a clandestine operation if the target could be photographed from overhead and such photography would reveal all needed details. The examples given do

25X1A

✓ suggest that the committee be omniscient and I believe it can approach this, if it is permitted to know all collection methods. When I speak of methods I do not mean that either details of the methods or identification of operations need necessarily be involved. My objective would be to ensure that at the earliest possible opportunity, if a target is unassailable by existing methods, that this be made known; in order that the RCC might bring this to the attention of USIB. In so doing I feel that the RCC should recommend that certain additional, specified actions must be taken in order to meet the requirement. Such action might run the gamut from establishment of an agent in a certain place within a given amount of time, recommendation of maximum political use of an over-flight or perhaps that \$14 million be spent in perfecting equipment which could give answers by technical means.

3. So far I have given the example as to how this committee could proceed, on a self-starting basis, to come up with a report to USIB as to how the intelligence community is meeting its obligations to the National Security Council. However, to function effectively this committee must also be willing to listen to the consumers who say they are not being served by the collectors and the collectors who maintain that they are being misused by the consumers. This is not a job that can be done at a low level or on a piece-meal basis. For instance: when the ABC division of OSI maintains that its requirements are not being satisfied the committee should study the fact of how many other such requirements exist, how closely they are related to priority objectives, whether they are served on logical collection facilities or whether there is a chance that they have been levied on facilities which are already overburdened with more important requirements. In certain instances the committee might uncover the fact that too many rather unimportant requirements were clogging precious collection assets and the over-all recommendation might be somewhat different to the result hoped for by the complaining division. By the same token, an investigation of this sort, of a similar origin might decide that certain facilities under clandestine control, the [] program for instance, were clogged with high priority requirements which they could never hope to meet and the resulting decision might be that the weapons hardware type of requirement or others of an impossible priority for legal travellers should be re-scheduled and that such channels should be left clear for the non-military conflict type of requirement, admittedly of a lower priority but quite obviously more suitable to this type of collection facility. Turning from the consumer to the collector the same type of spontaneous referrals to the RCC may be expected. For example: if a complaint came from the Clandestine Services, to the effect

25X11A

that consumers were expecting them to handle requirements which in the estimation of the Clandestine Services could be met elsewhere, the same sort of investigation as that outlined in the early portions of this paragraph would be undertaken. I imagine that most of the time such an investigation will lead toward the identification of non-clandestine facilities capable of developing the required information, with a consequent relief of the Clandestine Services. However, in other instances it is quite possible that after a thorough survey of all the facts it will be decided that the Clandestine Services must develop facilities to meet certain types of requirements. In either instance, if the RCC is of the desired level of competence and seniority, the judgement will have been based on a thorough study of all the facts and will therefore be instructive to all concerned.

4. In addition to the generation of activity arising from an immediate committee study of actions against Priority National Intelligence Objectives, as outlined in paragraph 2 and the committee's acceptance of responsibility to meet criticisms from both consumer and collector elements, I feel that the committee should have an orderly program for providing USIB with an annual review of actions taken to meet PNIO's, and facilities for continuing action, just prior to the annual revision of the PNIO's. I also consider that when problems arise which demand the development of collection facilities, as in the case of the SIBIR's, the RCC should act on these. With particular reference to the last point, I consider that the CCPC should be abolished in favor of this new committee. X

5. With reference to other committees, I see no reason for interfering with any of these. SIC, JAEIC, GMAIC, EIC, etc., are actually more concerned with substance and production than with the collection aspects. However, if one of these committees does get involved in collection to the extent that it produces a community requirement this will actually assist the work of the RCC. Any requirement produced by one of these committees will presumably be aimed at a Priority Intelligence Objective and will not duplicate other requirements. The role of RCC would actually be assisted by any action of such committees to produce requirements as it could assume that such requirements represented the ultimate in community needs. The only role for RCC would be to ensure proper tasking to collection assets. IPC would carry on its functions as usual but its mission should be made easier by the very existence of RCC because during the course of its business RCC will be developing a community agreed concept of the role and capacity of the Clandestine Services. With such an understanding, the Chairman, IPC would have clear guidance as to the amount and number of targets suitable for clandestine collection and he could apply this agreed yard-stick, rather than try to arbitrate totally unrealistic submissions. I will not try to get into such other committees as the COMINT and ELINT ✓

committees except for one point. This is that I cannot see that ELCOM has any very clear role in requirements. I do not believe there is a need for such a thing as a community list of ELINT requirements (ERL). I consider that there are and will be requirements for collection of information on the radiators of priority targets and that some of these may require the use of electronic intercept equipment. Call these ELINT requirements if you will but they are actually no more validly so named than a similar request to take a photograph of some aspect of a priority target. At this juncture the camera becomes a collection device just the same as the ELINT intercept gear.

6. I feel that the argument as to whether this committee is composed of consumers or collectors is superfluous. The committee should be composed of senior representatives of both elements. They should be sufficiently senior, along the lines of CCPC, either to know all aspects of each problem within their own shops or to bring along thoroughly competent staff support when such technical expertise is required. It is essential that the board be privy to the entire gamut of collection devices and that it have the proper clearances. The Chairman must have the ability and the time to understand all aspects of the problems that will be presented. He must be able to negotiate relentlessly. The RCC must receive its authority directly from USIB and report directly to that body. Its charter should be relatively simple, aimed at the objective of achieving satisfaction of PNIO's through proper tasking of all collection facilities. Further it must be instructed to report directly to USIB any collection inadequacy and to include a recommendation as to how to remedy the situation. By the same token it should report to USIB discrepancies between the PNIO's as reflected in the emphasis given requirements and the RCC interpretation of information needed for the protection of our national security. An alternate title might be Requirements and Collection Coordinating Committee (RACCC).

25X11A



19 April 1961

SECRET

25X1

DRAFT -
1 Dec 61

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT:

Joint Study Group Recommendations for a
Central Body for Reviewing Requirements

25X1

REFERENCE:

- a. JSG Report Section VI
- b. memo, dated 19 Apr 61
"USIB - Requirements Control Committee"
- c. memo to
dated 14 Sep 61 "A Central Requirements
Registry in CIA", para 3 and the
Attachment.

25X1

25X1

1. As stated in paragraph 3 of reference c, I feel that certain parts of the text of reference a, some of which are quoted in the Attachment to reference c, make an eloquent case for a central body for reviewing requirements, manned by top quality experts from the intelligence community. In reference b I tentatively dubbed this the Requirements Control Committee but actually prefer the more cumbersome but descriptive name: Requirements and Collection Coordinating Committee (RACCC). As you have read references b and c and as they are available to you in AD/DCI files, I shall confine this to what I consider should be the essentials of the RACCC.

2. In describing the RACCC, after specifying its need for top quality experts, the JSG report also requires that they represent "- - -all the agencies which either produce intelligence reports or collect intelligence information." What is described

SECRET

SECRET

is a working level USIB which should inherently have more responsibility than any other USIB committee, because requirements and collection are the fuel and wheels of the intelligence vehicle. In my estimation RACCC must be a committee, rather than another community body such as the AC/DCI. It will require a staff drawn from USIB but this should preferably be at the GS-13 and 14 level, directed towards working with existing groups rather than brain picking and writing its own reports.

3. The first responsibility of RACCC might be the annual review of the PNIO's. This is, of course, a substantive function but the impact of the PNIO's is so important to the collection effort that they should perhaps be produced by a group willing to support each item and as well, have a thorough understanding of the concept. Although this argument may sound a little tenuous, I was recently astonished to hear a member of IPC say that his agency had never really agreed to the most recent PNIO's. However, whether or not RACCC actually establishes the PNIO's, its first order of business should be to study the requirements designed to meet the priority objectives and then investigate the actual capability of the collectors who have the requirements.

4. The RACCC actions on the PNIO's must be conducted simultaneously, initially and in a series of steps later. Initially

SECRET

SECRET

the outstanding requirements up for scrutiny must be studied with the collector, before any attempt is made at rewrite. Although some may be shredded out and sent back for reworking, it is expected that others, which leave something to be desired in the eyes of the purist, are good enough to get the point across. RACCC must not be a nit-picking committee.

5. In surveying the ability of collectors to meet requirements it is expected that, in broad terms, three situations will be met:

- a. Some collectors can do a better job by increasing or redirecting effort;
- b. Some collectors are essential to optimum results but to achieve them a major dislocations or redirections are involved;
- c. No collectors can meet the requirements with their present capability, directives, budget, etc.

6. In the case of situation a., the collectors will be expected to accept the guidance of RACCC and increase or redirect efforts as recommended. RACCC will file its report and tickle for review, with the collectors involved, in six months or so. In situation b., if the collector cannot proceed as in a., even on a trial basis, RACCC will send the collector a memorandum recommending action. This may be used as a lever for internal action or may, at the collector's discretion be forwarded to USIB for consideration. As in a., RACCC will review in six months. In both a. and b.,

SECRET

SECRET

if the RACCC review shows progress, such progress will be reported in a routine, annual report to USIB. However, if no progress has been made the situation will be reported immediately to USIB. In the latter type of report the RACCC emphasis and objective should be to enlist assistance for a frustrated collector, not to indicate criticism for poor performance.

7. In situation c., where it appears that a major policy decision is needed, RACCC must report directly to USIB. The report will do three things:

- a. Give a run-down on the present action of each collector;
- b. Present the ideas of selected collectors as to how they might satisfy the requirement;
- c. Summarize RACCC views as to which action or actions would give optimum results. These views could well transcend the ideas presented in b. as the optimum action might involve very expensive facilities or equipment, the operation of which might be on a community basis or assigned arbitrarily.

8. The next function of RACCC would be to listen to the views or complaints of producers on the adequacy of the collectors and vice versa. Although the tendency would be to concentrate on the problems of producers in ^{the} ~~this~~ area of high priority requirements that are not being met, it would be a mistake to make this a blanket rule. One overall objective of RACCC should be to balance

SECRET

SECRET

the time and effort of collectors. Consideration of complaints from producers writing requirements in lower priority areas will help to redirect some requirements to collectors who can never hit the highest, and thereby achieve an overall balance.

9. The same principle will also apply to complaints from collectors. There will be instances where a collector objects to low level requirements as diverting him from the priority ones. However, on examination it may be found that this collector should concentrate on the low level because this is where his real ability lies. At the other end of the spectrum there will be cases referred involving high priority targets and the same steps involved in the RACCC self-initiated scrutiny of the PNIO's will be involved.

10. I consider that the functions given above are fundamental and essential and I believe they should be embarked on, in the spirit suggested, before any ancillary responsibilities are considered. A full time Chairman will be needed, as well as a staff. In my estimation the advantages of a full time or close to full time chairman have been demonstrated in COMOR. In addition, in RACCC the chairman must be in a position to give a preliminary hearing to producers and collectors who believe they are faced by a situation requiring full RACCC consideration. Some fact finding by the staff, followed by a judicious examination

SECRET

SECRET

of all aspects between the querying agency and the chairman,
will result in either a clear cut presentation worthy of RACCC
exploitation or a dropping of the case.

SECRET

SECRET

16 APRIL 1962

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Coordination/DCI

SUBJECT: Coordination of Requirements and Collection

1. As you know, OSI has endorsed the suggestion that CCPC be revamped and charged with the coordination of requirements and collection. I believe that with a permanent Chairman and staff such a committee could enhance the collection effort to a point of efficiency that can never be achieved under the present loose, more or less voluntary type of coordination. However, as we are all well aware there are pitfalls which may impede committees at the outset and in the case of the complex field of requirements and collection, I believe your staff can make a contribution which will lay the groundwork and set the pattern for the proposed committee; thereby removing the pitfall of exploring unproductive avenues or getting mired in too much detail.

2. I would hope that your staff could make a preliminary survey of consumers and collectors in order to identify the major problems that should subsequently be attacked by the committee. Functioning as a staff for the DCI your people are experienced, known to the community and will be objective. Whereas, such a survey, made at the direction of a committee chairman without a staff such as yours at his disposal, could well waste valuable time, particularly in culling out subjective opinions. This is not a reflection on a yet unborn committee but recognition of the capability of your staff and the fact, noted in the write-up of your mission, that in functioning as a staff the members are able to shed the feeling of responsibility towards a single agency and concentrate on problems from the community standpoint.

3. My recommendation is that AC/DCI select a number of the highest Priority National Intelligence Objectives, review the requirements that have been written for each and make a detailed check of what is the status of each from the standpoint of collection. The latter step will require that collectors give an

SECRET

SECRET

SUBJECT: Coordination of Requirements and Collection

honest evaluation of each pertinent requirement and be equally honest in revealing steps taken for collection and the chances of success. A survey of this sort will give a clear picture of what our chances are of getting intelligence on priority objectives and this should be a good base for committee action. In the past DD/I has attempted such a survey, on a very limited basis and the fact that emerges is that there is a very real need for new and realistic tasking of collection facilities, as well as for the development of new facilities and collection devices.

4. You might prefer to stick to the survey outlined above but while your staff is talking to consumers and collectors they may wish to elicit the comments of each on the overall performance of the others. Experience shows that in some instances the "where there's smoke there's fire" adage holds good. Sometimes consumers' requirements are inadequate, sometimes collectors are not doing a thorough job. Most of the time, however, it will be found that misunderstanding of needs and capabilities are the real roots of criticism. Whichever the case the findings should be more grist to the mill of the proposed committee.

5. I urge that you give serious consideration to the idea of using your staff in the capacity I have outlined. If you agree that it has merit and is feasible we shall be prepared to discuss it with you in more detail.

HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.
Assistant Director
Scientific Intelligence

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - addressee

2 - AD/SI

3 - Staff/SI

OSI:Staff rh/6516 (16 Apr 62)

25X1A

SECRET